

Boolean algebras with prescribed topological densities*

L. Soukup

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We give a simplified proof of a theorem of M. Rabus and S. Shelah claiming that for each cardinal μ there is a c.c.c Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$ with topological density μ .

The *topological density* $d(B)$ of a Boolean algebra B is the minimal cardinal μ such that $B \setminus \{0_B\}$ can be covered by μ ultrafilters.

Theorem 1 (M. Rabus and S. Shelah). *For each cardinal μ there is a c.c.c Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$ with topological density μ .*

The simplest way to guarantee $d(B) \geq \mu$ for some Boolean algebra B is to find a family $\mathcal{A} \subset B \setminus \{0_B\}$ of size μ such that $a \wedge a' = 0$ for each $\{a, a'\} \in [\mathcal{A}]^2$. Obviously if B satisfies c.c.c then this argument can not work for $\mu \geq \omega_1$. However, instead of finding μ elements of B with pairwise empty intersections it is enough to require that B contains sequences with “prescribedly small pairwise intersections”:

Observation 2. *Let B be a Boolean algebra, μ be a cardinal. Assume that there is a set $X \subset B \setminus \{0\}$ such that X is not the union of finitely many centered sets and for each $\nu < \mu$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \langle x_\xi : \xi < \nu^+ \rangle \subset X \quad \forall F : [\nu^+]^2 \xrightarrow{1-1} \nu^+ \\ \exists \langle y_\xi : \xi < \nu^+ \rangle \subset X \quad \forall \{\xi, \zeta\} \in [\nu^+]^2 \quad y_\xi \wedge y_\zeta \leq x_{F(\xi, \zeta)}. \quad (\dagger) \end{aligned}$$

Then the topological density of B is at least μ .

Proof of the observation. Assume on the contrary that $d(B) < \mu$. Let ν be the minimal cardinal such that X can be covered by ν many ultrafilters, $\{U_\zeta : \zeta < \nu\}$. Clearly $\omega \leq \nu \leq d(B) < \mu$.

Let $F : [\nu^+]^2 \longrightarrow \nu^+$ be an injective function such that $(F(\alpha, \gamma) \bmod \nu) \neq (F(\beta, \gamma) \bmod \nu)$ for $\alpha < \beta < \gamma < \nu^+$. Then for each $I \in [\nu^+]^{\nu^+}$ and $\sigma < \nu$ there is $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [I]^2$ such that $\sigma < (F(\alpha, \beta) \bmod \nu)$.

*The preparation of this paper was supported by the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research grant no. 25745 and JSPS grant n.o. P 98259

For each $\xi < \nu^+$ pick an element $x_\xi \in X \setminus \bigcup \{U_\zeta : \zeta < (\xi \bmod \nu)\}$. By $(\dagger)$ we can find $\langle y_\xi : \xi < \nu^+ \rangle \subset X$ such that $y_\xi \wedge y_\zeta \leq x_{F(\xi, \zeta)}$ for each $\{\xi, \zeta\} \in [\nu^+]^2$.

Since $X \subset \bigcup_{\zeta < \nu} U_\zeta$, there is $\rho < \nu$ such that $I = \{\xi : y_\xi \in U_\rho\}$ is of size ν^+ . Then there is $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [I]^2$ such that $\rho < (F(\alpha, \beta) \bmod \rho)$. Thus $x_{F(\alpha, \beta)} \notin U_\rho$ by the choice of $x_{F(\alpha, \beta)}$. On the other hand, $y_\alpha \wedge y_\beta \in U_\rho$, which contradicts $y_\alpha \wedge y_\beta \leq x_{F(\alpha, \beta)}$. $\square$

Unfortunately $(\dagger)$ is still too strong to be held in a c.c.c Boolean algebra of topological density $\leq \mu$. But, as it turns out, it is not necessary to consider all the sequences $\langle x_\xi : \xi < \nu^+ \rangle$ in $(\dagger)$ to derive that the topological density of B is at least μ . We will introduce the index set T in the proof below in order to construct a manageable, but still large enough family of sequences.

A simplified proof of theorem 1. The length of a sequence τ is denoted by $\ell(\tau)$. If $\ell(\tau) = \alpha + 1$ then put $\mathbf{b}(\tau) = \tau \upharpoonright \alpha$. Given sequences ρ and τ we write $\rho \triangleleft \tau$ to mean that ρ is an initial segment of τ . Denote by $\mathbf{2}$ the trivial Boolean algebra $\{0, 1\}$.

For each $\nu < \mu$ choose a function $h_{\nu^+} : [\nu^+]^2 \rightarrow \nu^+$ such that h_{ν^+} is 1-1 and $(h_{\nu^+}(\alpha, \gamma) \bmod \nu) \neq (h_{\nu^+}(\beta, \gamma) \bmod \nu)$ for $\alpha < \beta < \gamma < \nu^+$. Then for each $I \in [\nu^+]^{\nu^+}$ and $\sigma < \nu$ there is $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [I]^2$ such that $\sigma < (h_{\nu^+}(\alpha, \beta) \bmod \nu)$.

Definition 3. We define, by induction on $\alpha \leq \mu^+$, T_α as follows:

- (1) $T_0 = \{\emptyset\}$,
- (2) if α is limit, then $T_\alpha = \bigcup \{T_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$,
- (3) if $\alpha = \beta + 1$ then let

$$T_\alpha = T_\beta \cup \left\{ \rho : \rho \text{ is a sequence of length } < \mu^+ \text{ and for each } \zeta < \ell(\rho) \right. \\ \left. \text{either } \rho(\zeta) \in \mu \text{ or } (\rho(\zeta) \in T_\beta \text{ and } \rho \upharpoonright \zeta \triangleleft \rho(\zeta)) \right\}.$$

Let $T = T_{\mu^+}$. For $\eta \in T$ let $\text{rank}(\eta) = \min\{\alpha : \eta \in T_\alpha\}$. For $\rho \in T$ we say that ρ is a *sequence with nice tail* iff we can write $\rho = \rho^\downarrow \smallfrown \rho^\uparrow$, where $(\ell(\rho^\downarrow) \bmod \mu) = 0$, $\ell(\rho^\uparrow) = \nu^+$ for some $\nu < \mu$ and $\rho \upharpoonright \zeta \triangleleft \rho(\zeta)$ for each $\ell(\rho^\downarrow) \leq \zeta < \ell(\rho)$.

Let $T_{\text{nt}} = \{\rho \in T : \rho \text{ is sequence with nice tail}\}$. For $\rho \in T_{\text{nt}}$ put $E(\rho) = \{\rho \smallfrown \langle i \rangle : i < \ell(\rho)\}$. The sets $E(\rho)$ are pairwise disjoint.

Definition 4. Define the function F as follows. Let

$$\text{dom}(F) = \bigcup \{[E(\rho)]^2 : \rho \in T_{\text{nt}}\}.$$

For $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in [E(\rho)]^2$ write $\tau_i = \rho \smallfrown \langle k_i \rangle$ and $\rho = \rho^\downarrow \smallfrown \rho^\uparrow$ and put

$$F(\tau_0, \tau_1) = \rho^\uparrow(h_{\ell(\rho^\uparrow)}(k_0, k_1))$$

Definition 5. For $\eta \in T$ let

$$D(\eta) = \{ \{\eta \smallfrown \langle \emptyset \rangle \smallfrown \langle \omega n + i \rangle, \eta \smallfrown \langle \emptyset \rangle \smallfrown \langle \omega n + j \rangle\} : i < j < n < \omega \}$$

and $D = \bigcup \{D(\eta) : \eta \in T\}$.

Definition 6. Let $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ be the Boolean algebra generated by $\{x_\eta : \eta \in T\}$ freely, except the relations in the following set $\Gamma \cup \Delta$:

$$\Gamma = \{x_{\tau_0} \wedge x_{\tau_1} \leq x_{F(\tau_0, \tau_1)} : \{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in \text{dom}(F)\},$$

$$\Delta = \{x_{\tau_0} \wedge x_{\tau_1} = 0 : \{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in D\}.$$

Lemma 7. $d(\mathcal{B}_\mu) \geq \mu$.

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \nu = \min \{ \nu' : \text{there are } \eta \in T \text{ and ultrafilters } \langle U_j : j < \nu' \rangle \\ \text{such that } \{x_\tau : \eta \triangleleft \tau\} \subset \bigcup \{U_j : j < \nu'\} \}. \end{aligned}$$

It is enough to show that $\nu = \mu$. Assume on the contrary that $\nu < \mu$ witnessed by $\eta \in T$ and ultrafilters $\langle U_j : j < \nu \rangle$. We can assume that $\ell(\eta) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mu}$. First observe that $\nu \geq \omega$ because $D(\eta)$ can not be covered by finitely many ultrafilters either.

Construct a sequence ρ of length ν^+ such that for each $\zeta < \nu^+$:

$$\eta \frown (\rho \upharpoonright \zeta) \triangleleft \rho(\zeta) \in T \text{ and } x_{\rho(\zeta)} \notin \bigcup \{U_j : j < (\zeta \pmod{\nu})\}. \quad (\star)$$

Assume we have constructed $\rho(\xi)$ for $\xi < \zeta$ satisfying $(\star)$. Then $\eta \frown (\rho \upharpoonright \zeta) \in T$ by definition. Since ν was minimal we have

$$\{x_\tau : \eta \frown (\rho \upharpoonright \zeta) \triangleleft \tau\} \not\subset \bigcup \{U_j : j < (\zeta \pmod{\nu})\}$$

and so we can choose a suitable $\rho(\zeta)$.

Now $\eta \frown \rho \in T_{\text{nt}}$. For $i < \nu^+$ write $\tau_i = \eta \frown \rho \frown \langle i \rangle$. Since $\{\tau_i : i < \nu^+\} \subset \bigcup \{U_\alpha : \alpha < \nu\}$ there are $I \in [\nu^+]^{\nu^+}$ and $\alpha < \nu$ such that $\tau_i \in U_\alpha$ for each $i \in I$. Pick $\{i, j\} \in [I]^2$ such that $h_{\nu^+}(i, j) > (\alpha \pmod{\nu})$. Then $x_{F(\tau_i, \tau_j)} = x_{\rho(h_{\nu^+}(i, j))} \notin U_\alpha$ by $(\star)$. But $x_{\tau_i} \wedge x_{\tau_j} \in U_\alpha$ which contradicts $x_{\tau_i} \wedge x_{\tau_j} \leq x_{F(\tau_i, \tau_j)}$. $\square$

Definition 8. We say that $X \subset T$ is *closed* provided:

- (i) if $\rho \in X$ and $\ell(\rho) = \alpha + 1$ then $\mathbf{b}(\rho) = \rho \upharpoonright \alpha \in X$,
- (ii) if $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \in \text{dom}(F) \cap [X]^2$ then $F(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in X$,
- (iii) if $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \in D$ and $\tau_1 \in X$ then $\tau_2 \in X$.

Lemma 9. Every finite $X \subset T$ is contained in a finite closed $Y \subset T$.

Proof. Observing $D \cap \text{dom}(F) = \emptyset$ close X first for i and ii, then close for iii. $\square$

Definition 10. Let $X \subset T$ be closed and $f : X \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$. We say that $(*)_f$ holds iff

- (1) $f(\tau_1) \wedge f(\tau_2) = 0$ for each $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \in D \cap [\text{dom}(f)]^2$,
- (2) $f(\tau_1) \wedge f(\tau_2) \leq f(F(\tau_1, \tau_2))$ for each $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \in \text{dom}(F) \cap [\text{dom}(f)]^2$.

The following lemma is a special case of a well-known fact.

Lemma 11. *Assume that $f : T \longrightarrow \mathbf{2}$. Then there is a (unique) homomorphism φ_f from $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ into $\mathbf{2}$ such that $\varphi_f(x_\tau) = f(\tau)$ iff $(*)_f$ holds.*

For each $a \in \mathcal{B}_T \setminus \{0\}$ fix a homomorphism $\psi_a : \mathcal{B}_T \longrightarrow \mathbf{2}$ with $\psi_a(a) = 1$, and finite, closed set $X_a \subset T$ such that a is a Boolean combination of $\{x_\tau : \tau \in X_a\}$. Define $f_a : X_a \longrightarrow \mathbf{2}$ by $f_a(\tau) = \psi_a(x_\tau)$.

Lemma 12. $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ has precaliber κ for each $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_0$.

Proof. Let $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \subset \mathcal{B}_\mu \setminus \{0\}$.

It is enough to define a map $f : T \longrightarrow \mathbf{2}$ satisfying $(*)_f$ such that $|\{\alpha : f_{a_\alpha} \subset f\}| = \kappa$ because $f_{a_\alpha} \subset f$ implies $1 = \psi_{a_\alpha}(a_\alpha) = \varphi_{f_{a_\alpha}}(a_\alpha) = \varphi_f(a_\alpha)$.

By thinning out $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ we can assume that $\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a Δ -system with kernel X and that $f_\alpha \upharpoonright X = f'$.

A pair $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \in \text{dom}(F)$ is called *crossing pair* if there are $\alpha \neq \beta < \kappa$ such that $\tau_1 \in X_\alpha \setminus X$ and $\tau_2 \in X_\beta \setminus X$. The family of crossing pairs is denoted by $\mathcal{CP}$.

For $\gamma \in \omega_1$ let

$$\mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(1)} = \{\{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in \mathcal{CP} : F(\tau_0, \tau_1) \in X_\gamma\}.$$

Claim 12.1. $|\mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(1)}| \leq |X||X_\gamma|$.

Proof of the claim 12.1. Let $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(1)}$, $\tau_i = \tau \cap \langle k_i \rangle$, $\tau \in X$, $\eta = F(\tau_0, \tau_1) \in X_\gamma$. Then the pair $\langle \tau, \eta \rangle$ determines the pair $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\}$. Indeed, $F \upharpoonright [E(\tau)]^2$ is 1-1, so $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\}$ is the unique pair $\{\tau'_0, \tau'_1\} \in [E(\tau)]^2$ with $F(\tau'_0, \tau'_1) = \eta$. $\square$

We say that τ_0 and τ_1 are *twins* iff $\tau_0 \neq \tau_1$ but $\mathbf{b}(\tau_0) = \mathbf{b}(\tau_1)$.

$$\mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(2)} = \{\{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in \mathcal{CP} : \exists \eta \in X_\gamma \text{ } F(\tau_0, \tau_1) \text{ and } \eta \text{ are twins}\}.$$

Claim 12.2. $|\mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(2)}| \leq |X||X_\gamma|$.

Proof of claim 12.2. Let $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(2)}$, $\tau_i = \tau \cap \langle k_i \rangle$, $\tau \in X$. Fix $\eta \in X_\gamma$ such that $F(\tau_0, \tau_1)$ and η are twins. Now the pair $\langle \tau, \eta \rangle$ determines the pair $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\}$. Indeed, $F(\tau_0, \tau_1) = \tau(\xi)$ for some ξ , and there is at most one ξ such that $\tau(\xi)$ and η are twins. But τ and ξ determine $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\}$ because $F \upharpoonright [E(\tau)]^2$ is 1-1. $\square$

Let

$$\mathcal{B}^{(3)} = \{\{\{\tau_0, \tau_1\}, \{\tau_2, \tau_3\}\} \in [\mathcal{CP}]^2 : F(\tau_0, \tau_1) \text{ and } F(\tau_2, \tau_3) \text{ are twins}\}.$$

Claim 12.3. $|\mathcal{B}^{(3)}| \leq |X||X|$.

Proof of claim 12.3. Assume that $\{\{\tau_0, \tau_1\}, \{\tau_2, \tau_3\}\} \in [\mathcal{CP}]^2$. Then $\mathbf{b}(\tau_0) = \mathbf{b}(\tau_1) = \eta \in X$ and $\mathbf{b}(\tau_2) = \mathbf{b}(\tau_3) = \rho \in X$. Moreover $F(\tau_0, \tau_1) = \eta(\xi)$ and $F(\tau_2, \tau_3) = \rho(\zeta)$ for some ξ and ζ . But for given $\eta, \rho \in X$ there is at most one pair $\{\xi, \zeta\}$ such that $\eta(\xi)$ and $\rho(\zeta)$ are twins. Since there is at most one $\{\tau'_0, \tau'_1\} \in E(\eta)$ with $F(\tau'_0, \tau'_1) = \eta(\xi)$ and there is at most one $\{\tau'_2, \tau'_3\} \in E(\rho)$ with $F(\tau'_2, \tau'_3) = \rho(\zeta)$, we are done. $\square$

So applying Lázár's free set mapping theorem we can thin out our sequence such that $\mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(1)} = \mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(2)} = \mathcal{B}^{(3)} = \emptyset$ for each $\gamma \in \kappa$.

Let $f^- = \bigcup \{f_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$. Define $f : T \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ as follows. Let $f(\eta) = 1$ iff either $f^-(\eta) = 1$ or $\eta = F(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ for some $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in \mathcal{CP}$ such that $f^-(\tau_1) = f^-(\tau_2) = 1$.

Since $\bigcup_{\gamma < \kappa} \mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(1)} = \emptyset$ we have $f^- \subset f$.

We show that $(*)_f$ holds. Assume that τ_0 and τ_1 are twins and $f(\tau_0) = f(\tau_1) = 1$. Since $\mathcal{B}^{(3)} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{B}_\gamma^{(2)} = \emptyset$ for each $\gamma < \kappa$, it follows that $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \bigcup \{X_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} = \text{dom}(f^-)$. So $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in D$ is impossible because $\tau_0 \in X_\gamma$ implies $\tau_1 \in X_\gamma$. Thus $\{\tau_0, \tau_1\} \in \text{dom}(F)$ and $f^-(\tau_0) = f^-(\tau_1) = 1$ and so $f(F(\tau_0, \tau_1)) = 1$ by the construction of f . $\square$

Lemma 13. $d(\mathcal{B}_\mu) \leq \mu$.

Proof. First fix a well-ordering $\prec$ of T such that if $\text{rank}(\tau) < \text{rank}(\tau')$ then $\tau \prec \tau'$.

Let $T^- = T \setminus \bigcup \{E(\eta) : \eta \in T_{\text{nt}}\}$. Consider the product space

$$\mathcal{X} = 2^{T^-} \times (D_{[\mu]^{<\omega}})^{T_{\text{nt}}},$$

where $D_{[\mu]^{<\omega}}$ denotes the discrete topological space of size μ whose underlying set is $[\mu]^{<\omega}$ instead of μ . Applying $d((D_\mu)^{2^\mu}) = \mu$ and $|T| = 2^\mu$ we can fix a dense family $\{g_\xi : \xi < \mu\} \subset \mathcal{X}$. Write $g_\xi = \langle g_\xi^-, g_\xi^* \rangle$. For $\xi < \mu$ define $s_\xi : T \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ as follows: $s_\xi \upharpoonright T^- = g_\xi^-$ and if $\tau \in T \setminus T^-$, then pick the unique $\eta \in T_{\text{nt}}$ with $\tau \in E(\eta)$, $\tau = \eta \smallfrown \langle i \rangle$, and let $s_\xi(\tau) = 1$ iff $i \in g_\xi^*(\eta)$. Let

$$\mathcal{S} = \{s_\xi : \xi < \mu\}.$$

For $\xi < \mu$ define $s_\xi^* : T \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ by recursion on $\prec$ as follows. Let $s_\xi^*(\tau) = 1$ iff $s_\xi(\tau) = 1$ and for each $\{\tau, \tau'\} \in D$ with $\tau' \prec \tau$ we have $s_\xi^*(\tau') = 0$ and for each $\{\tau', \tau\} \in \text{dom}(F)$ with $\tau' \prec \tau$ we have $s_\xi^*(\tau') \leq s_\xi^*(F(\tau, \tau'))$.

By induction on $\prec$ it is clear that $(*)_{s_\xi^*}$ holds.

Now let $a \in \mathcal{B}_T \setminus \{0\}$. By construction of $\mathcal{S}$ we can find $s_\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $f_a \subset s_\xi$, moreover for each $\eta \in T_{\text{nt}} \cap X_a$ if $\tau \in E(\eta) \setminus X_a$ then $s_\xi(\tau) = 0$.

Claim 13.1. $s_\xi^* \supset f_a$.

Proof. By induction on $\prec$. Assume that the claim holds for $\tau' \in X_a$ provided $\tau' \prec \tau$. We can assume $f_a(\tau) = 1$. If $\{\tau', \tau\} \in D$, $\tau' \prec \tau$ then $\tau' \in X_a$ so $f_a(\tau') = 0$ as $(*)_{f_a}$ holds. So, by the induction hypothesis, $s_\xi^*(\tau') = f_a(\tau') = 0$. Assume $\{\tau', \tau\} \in \text{dom}(F)$, $\tau' \prec \tau$. If $\tau' \in X_a$ then $F(\tau', \tau) \in X_a$ and $F(\tau', \tau) \prec \tau$ so $f_a(\tau') = s_\xi^*(\tau')$ and $f_a(F(\tau', \tau)) = s_\xi^*(F(\tau', \tau))$. Thus $s_\xi^*(\tau') \leq s_\xi^*(F(\tau', \tau)) = 1$ because $f_a(\tau') = f_a(\tau) \wedge f_a(\tau') \leq f_a(F(\tau', \tau))$ as $(*)_{f_a}$ holds. If $\tau' \notin X_a$ then $s_\xi(\tau') = 0$ by the assumption about s_ξ and so $s_\xi^*(\tau') = 0$. Thus $s_\xi^*(\tau) = 1$ by the construction of f^* . $\square$

Thus $f_a(a) = s_\xi^*(a)$, i.e. $\mathcal{B}_T \setminus \{\emptyset\} = \bigcup \{\varphi_{s_\xi^*}^{-1}\{1\} : \gamma < \mu\}$, which was to be proved, so the lemma holds. $\square$

$\mathcal{B}_\mu$ is c.c.c by lemma 12 and $d(\mathcal{B}_\mu) = \mu$ by lemmas 13 and 7 so the theorem is proved. $\square$

References

- [1] M. Rabus, S. Shelah, *Topological density of ccc Boolean algebras - every cardinality occurs*, PROC. AM. MATH. SOC. Vol 127 (1999). No 9. pp. 2573-2581.